UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,976	11/20/2003	Syed F.A. Hossainy	50623.317	2726
Victor Repkin	7590 02/03/200	EXAMINER		
	& Dempsey L.L.P.	ROGERS, JAMES WILLIAM		
1 Maritime Plaza San Francisco, CA 94111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/718,976	HOSSAINY ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	JAMES W. ROGERS	1618
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 № 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)	are withdrawn from consideration.	cation.
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/25/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3,5-8,16-21,23-26,34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The instant claims are drawn to a medical article comprising an implantable substrate having a coating the coating includes a polymer or copolymer containing a carboxylated poly(lactic acid) (PLA) that contains the following structure:

Application/Control Number: 10/718,976 Page 3

Art Unit: 1618

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the prevention of the instant invention. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

(1) the nature of the invention;(2) the breadth of the claims;(3) the state of the prior art;(4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art;(5) the relative skill of those in the art;(6) the amount of direction or guidance presented;(7) the presence or absence of

working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

(1) The nature of the invention;

The claims are drawn to a medical article comprising an implantable substrate having a coating the coating includes a polymer or copolymer containing a carboxylated PLA that contains the following structure:

Application/Control Number: 10/718,976

Art Unit: 1618

HO-R-COOH

(2) The breadth of the claims:

Claims 1-3,5-8,16-21,23-26,34-36 embraces a medical article that comprises a substrate and a coating comprising a carboxylated PLA.

(3) The state of the prior art:

The state of the art regarding PLA polymers produced by ring opening polymerization of lactide with a ring opening catallyst such as applicants claimed hydroxy acid is very high. However, the state of the art for a catalyst which reacts with the alpha methylated carbon instead of the carbonyl group on the lactide is very low or does not exist. For instance it is well known in the art that a nucleophilic catalyst such as an alkoxide anion will react with lactide via a ring opening process as shown in the scheme below:

Scheme 1

Art Unit: 1618

The examiners position is well known and supported within the art, some of the numerous teachings on lactide ring openings are found within the references cited. Ovitt et al. J. Am Chem. Soc., 1999, 121 (16), 4072-4073 and Odian, Principles of Polymerization, 3rd edition, John Wiley and Sons, INC, pages 569-572. However it is not well known that a nucleophile such as an alkoxide can react and open lactide by nucleophilic attack on the methylated alpha carbon as shown below:

Scheme 2

It is noted that in order for applicant's claimed carboxylated PLA to form the claimed structure the hydroxy acid would have to attack the methylated alpha carbon in a similar manner to scheme 2. In fact if R is substituted for –R-COOH scheme 2 would be the same as applicants claimed carboxylated PLA.

(4) The predictability or unpredictability of the art:

As described above ring opening polymerizations of lactide is a mature field and it is well known that such ring opening occur by nucleophilic attack of the carbonyl atom in the lactide ring. However it is not known and therefore it cannot be considered predictable that a nucleophilic species would react with the methylated carbon on the lactide ring instead of reacting with the electrophilic carbonyl carbon on the lactide ring

Application/Control Number: 10/718,976 Page 6

Art Unit: 1618

which is the expected result that the art teaches. Note that the only way applicant's polymer could be made is by the hydroxyacid nuclephilically attacking the alpha methylated carbon on the lactide ring as shown in the scheme below:

Scheme 3

HO-R-COOH

(6)-(7) The amount of direction or guidance presented / working examples:

In the instant case, the guidance of the specification as to how the hydroxy acid is capable of producing the claimed carboxylated PLA which appears to be counterintuitive as to what the teaching of the art would suggest is completely lacking.

The specification as filed does not speak on or show any working examples or any studies performed that confirm that the connectivity of the carboxylated PLA as claimed. As noted above in order to produce a carboxylated with the claimed structure shown below:

Application/Control Number: 10/718,976

Art Unit: 1618

the hydroxy acid would have to react in some way with the methylated alpha carbon on the lactide ring, a result which would not be expected nor could it be considered as predictable since the teachings of the prior art would suggest that any nucleophilic substitution on a lactide ring would occur at the carbonyl carbon. The specification does not teach how or why the hydroxy acid could attach itself to the methylated alpha carbon of the lactide ring nor does the specification show experimental evidence that such a polymer was indeed produced. Note that lack of a working example, is a critical factor to be considered, especially in a case involving an unpredictable and undeveloped art. See MPEP 2194.

Page 7

(7) The quantity of experimentation necessary:

The instant claims read on a medical article comprising an implantable substrate having a coating the coating includes a polymer or copolymer containing carboxylated PLA that contains the following structure:

As discussed above the specification fails to provide any support for the carboxylated PLA claimed which requires that the hydroxy acid used to make the polymer is connected to the alpha methylated carbon of the lactide ring. Applicant fails to provide any information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue

Application/Control Number: 10/718,976 Page 8

Art Unit: 1618

experimentation. Genetech, 108 F. 3d at 1366 states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimation of general ideas that may or may not be workable.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James W. Rogers, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-7838. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Hartley can be reached on (571) 272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618